

Remarks/Arguments

Claims 7, 11, 22, 30 and 35-51 (including new claims 35-51) remain in this application.

The examiner has rejected claim 2 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

The examiner has rejected claims 1, 3-34 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by *Kikinis, et al.* (United States Patent 5,689,654).

The examiner has rejected claim 2 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kikinis, et al.*

In view of the above amendments and these remarks, reconsideration of the above noted rejections and objections is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 USC 112 and 103(a):

Claim 2 has been canceled by the above amendments. Applicant respectfully submits, therefore, that the grounds for the rejections of claim 2 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, and under 35 USC 103(a) have been rendered moot.

Rejections under 35 USC 102(b):

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of **claims 7, 11, 22 and 30** under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by *Kikinis, et al.* **Claims 7, 11, 22 and 30** are independent and have been amended above.

Claims 7, 22 and 30:

Amended independent **claim 7** recites:

the multi-functional device comprises at least one of a **still image camera, a video camera, a video recorder, a digital camcorder, a video player, a DVD player, a television, a CD player, an MP3 player, a tape player and a radio.**

Additionally, amended independent **claim 22** recites:

at least one of a **still image camera**, a **video camera**, a **video player**, a **DVD player**, a **VCR**, an **MP3 player**, a **CD player**, a **tape player**, a **video recorder**, a **digital camcorder**, a **phone**, a **game player**, a **television** and a **radio**.

Furthermore, amended independent **claim 30** recites:

the multi-functional device comprises at least one of a **still image camera**, a **video camera**, a **video recorder** a **digital camcorder**, a **video player**, a **DVD player**, a **television**, a **CD player**, an **MP3 player**, a **tape player** and a **radio**.

Applicant respectfully submits that *Kikinis, et al.* does not teach or suggest these limitations. Instead, *Kikinis, et al.* appears to disclose a personal digital assistant (PDA) having a PCMCIA form factor, so the PDA can fit into a PCMCIA slot of a host computer system. (Column 6, lines 35-48) The PDA is described having a variety of functions or features, including audio features using a microphone and a speaker. (Column 15, line 66 to column 16, line 17) *Kikinis, et al.*, however, appears not to disclose any of the functions or features shown in amended independent **claims 7, 22 and 30**. Applicant respectfully submits, therefore, that amended independent **claims 7, 22 and 30** are not anticipated by, are not obvious in view of, and are patentable over *Kikinis, et al.*, at least because the reference does not teach or fairly suggest a multi-functional device that comprises at least one of the functions/features listed.

Claim 11:

Amended independent **claim 11** recites:

when the multi-functional device is inserted into the internal device bay ..., the multi-functional device has a side that is **accessible externally** of the computer ...;

interface elements are **exposed** on the externally accessible side for use when the multi-functional device is inserted into the internal device bay and when the multi-functional device is removed from the internal device bay; and

the interface elements comprise at least one of a **removable media aperture**, an **eject button**, a **volume control dial**, a **headphone jack** and a **tuner knob**.

Applicant respectfully submits that *Kikinis, et al.* does not teach or suggest these limitations. Instead, *Kikinis, et al.* appears to disclose only an external connector portion 20 that is accessible externally of the host computer. (Column 7, lines 4-7; and Fig. 1B) Applicant respectfully submits, therefore, that amended independent **claim 11** is not anticipated by, is not obvious in view of, and is patentable over *Kikinis, et al.*, at least because the reference does not teach or fairly suggest interface elements of the type listed that are accessible whether the device is inserted into or removed from the computer.

New Claims:

Each of the new **claims 35-51** specifically recites one or more of the types of devices that the multi-functional device may comprise as listed in amended independent claims 7, 22 and 30. Therefore, applicant respectfully submits that new **claims 35-51** are not anticipated by, are not obvious in view of, and are patentable over the cited prior art at least for the same reasons as are amended independent claims 7, 22 and 30.

For the reasons specifically discussed above, and others, it is believed that pending **claims 7, 11, 22, 30 and 35-51** define patentable subject matter. Reconsideration of the previous rejections and objections as they might apply to the pending claims is therefore respectfully requested. Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

October 21, 2005
Date

Respectfully submitted, ,



L. Jon Lindsay
Registration No. 36,855
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT

L. Jon Lindsay
1857 W. Spring Water PL
Highlands Ranch, CO 80129
Telephone: 720-344-6189
Facsimile: 928-563-4114